R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 757 JC 680 074

A WORKSHOP OF INTEREST TO NEW PRESIDENTS WITH LITTLE BACKGROUND IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE--AN ANALYSIS.

BY- LUSKIN, BERNARD J.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.44 34P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *PRESIDENTS, *ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, INSERVICE EDUCATION, *WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES, CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS,

TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF A 1968 WORKSHOP FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WITH LITTLE PREVIOUS JUNIOR COLLEGE EXPERIENCE, 68 SUCH PRESIDENTS WERE SURVEYED BY LETTER AND FOUR OTHERS WERE INTERVIEWED. OF THE FOUR INTERVIEWEES AND THE 36 RESPONDENTS, ALL WERE IN FAVOR OF SUCH A WORKSHOP, PREFERABLY FOR ONE WEEK IN JULY. RELATIONSHIP WITH FACULTY WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEM ENCOUNTERED BY OVER HALF THE RESPONDENTS. TOPICS SUGGESTED FOR THE WORKSHOP INCLUDED HUMAN RELATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE, BUSINESS AND FINANCE, COMMUNITY SERVICE AND RELATIONSHIP, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ROLE AND FUNCTION, CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, PLANT AND FACILITIES, AND STUDENT SERVICES. METHODS SHOULD INCLUDE VISITS TO JUNIOR COLLEGES, STRUCTURED DISCUSSION, AND CASE METHOD. CATALOGS, ORGANIZATION CHARTS, AND MANUALS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE. WIVES SHOULD BE INVITED TO ATTEND. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED015757

A WORKSHOP OF INTEREST TO NEW PRESIDENTS WITH LITTLE BACKGROUND IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE: AN ANALYSIS

For
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of Education 470C

by
Bernard J. Luskin
Associate Dean, Federal Projects
Orange Coast Junior College District
2701 Fairview Road
Costa Mesa, California

Fall Quarter 1967

Ed 680 074

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ii

Statement of the Problem 1

Methods, Procedures, and Limitations 2

Background Information 8

Order of Presentation of Data 12

Topics

1. In your own situation, what problem or issue proved most difficult for you as a new president? 13

2. Suggested topics for the workshop 16

3. Methods and procedures for the workshop 19

4. Pre-prepared materials presidents felt desirable . . 21

5. Should Wives be invited? 22

6. Problem or issue most difficult for the wives of new presidents 24

7. Duration of the workshop 26

8. Month in which workshop should be held 26

Some General Conclusions 27

Footnotes 29

Bibliography 30

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Inquiry and Reply	7
II	Areas of Appointment of Junior College Presidents Appointed from Cognate Fields	10
III	In Your Own Situation, What Problem or Issue Proved Most Difficult for You as a New President?	13
IV	Suggested Topics for Consideration at a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents: Content	16
V	Methods and Procedures for Suggested Workshop	19
VI	Summary of Pre-prepared Materials Presidents Felt Desirable to be Assembled for Distribution	21
VII	For What Period of Time Should a Workshop Be Held, i.e., Duration and Month?	26

A WORKSHOP OF INTEREST TO NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WITH LITTLE BACKGROUND IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE: AN ANALYSIS

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this study to explore the views of junior college presidents who ascended to that position from areas other than the junior college, i.e., such cognate fields as higher education, secondary or elementary school administration, business and industry, governmental service, graduate school, et al, and to apply these views in determining the advisability of offering a workshop for such presidents. Further, if such determination is positive, to develop initial indications pointing to areas of study these presidents feel will be most helpful if presented in a workshop.

Specifically explored will be the feeling of the presidents regarding content, method and procedures, pre-prepared materials they feel would be desirable, the advisability of inviting and conducting sessions for wives, and length and time of the workshop.

Methods, Procedure, Scope, and Limitations

During the summer of 1967, Dr. B. Lamar Johnson sent letters to directors of education in various states in an attempt to identify those presidents who had been recently appointed and who, at the time of appointment, had little actual experience in the junior college.

An initial list was compiled and a letter prepared as presented on page 3, which was mailed on October 20, 1967, to sixty-eight college presidents and a modified version to twelve state directors.

Dear

We at UCLA are considering the possibility of holding--probably in the summer of 1968--a workshop for new junior college presidents who have had little or no junior college experience prior to becoming chief administrators. Your name has been given me (possibly incorrectly) as a president who at the time of his appointment was in this category.

My purpose in writing this letter is to ask whether in your judgment it would be desirable to hold such a workshop and, if so, to solicit your suggestions for it. Rather than sending you a questionnaire to which you might respond, I am expressing the hope that you may be willing to write me a letter with your suggestions and observations on such matters (please do not feel that it is incumbent on you to respond to all of the questions which follow) as these:

Content: In your own situation, what problem or issue proved to be most difficult for you as a new president? What topics or problems--in such areas, for example, as role and function of the junior college, curriculum and instruction, human relationships, student personnel services, community service and relationships, finance, plant and facilities, and administrative structure and relationships--should be considered at a workshop?

Method and procedures: What suggestions do you have regarding methods and procedures (for example, use of case method, use of "in-basket" items of the type that come to the desk of a president, unstructured discussion, structured discussion, lectures, visits to one or more junior colleges, social occasions) for use at a workshop?

Pre-prepared materials: Do you have in mind any types of materials which might to advantage be assembled--and in some instances perhaps specially prepared--prior to a workshop?

Wives: Ought wives be invited to such a workshop? If so, would it be desirable to have separate sessions for wives? Would a combination of some separate sessions for wives and some joint sessions of presidents and wives be desirable? In your situation what problem or issue has proved to be most difficult for your wife--as the wife of a new president?

Length of workshop: The suggestion has been made that the workshop should be held for a period of one week. Do you have any comments on this suggestion?

Time of workshop: Is July likely to be a convenient month (or at least as convenient as any) for a workshop for new presidents?

Other suggestions: Do you have any other suggestions regarding the proposed workshop?

This is, I fear, an overlong letter. I have, however, felt the necessity of writing at some length in order to indicate the scope of our present thinking and planning.

You may be sure that I will look forward to hearing from you and that I will be most grateful for any suggestions you may be willing to make.

Sincerely,

B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education

BLJ:sb

It was also decided that since several presidents from which information could be obtained were located in Southern California, that face-to-face interaction would provide additional insight in the preparation of findings.

Those interviewed were Mr. Chester DeVore, President, Southwestern College; Mr. Harold Hughes, Superintendent-President, Grossmont College; Mr. Jack Roper, Superintendent-President, Saddleback Junior College District; and Dr. Charles Wilson, Superintendent, North Orange County Junior College District.

The insight these presidents provided certainly lend strength to the preparation of this study, and I certainly appreciate their assistance since it helped me to prepare the results with confidence and understanding.

Each interview will not be presented, nor will the letters received in reply to the inquiry. It is my purpose in the study to synthesize the information with an eye to identifying trends in opinion so that facts provided will help to guide decisions as they are made in developing the workshop.

Here I must make a point that this is a preliminary study. The restraints of the quarter system press for results by December 9, yet information is being received daily and there is research that yet needs to be done. In fact, as is true with many problems, as one finds bits and pieces of information, he finds the way to much more.

Information from the state directors in response to our inquiry is yet incomplete, and I hesitate to put this information together

at this point since only 6 of the 12 replies have been received. As was mentioned, 68 letters to presidents were sent on October 20. Thirty-two replies have thus far been received and each day more come in. Further, on November 15, an additional 53 letters were sent to presidents around the country, and none of that group has yet had time to respond.

All results so far compiled are of necessity based on the 32 replies received, and the interviews, as of November 21, 1967. In all, 122 letters were mailed, and four interviews scheduled.

TABLE I

Inquiry and Reply

Note: For reference purposes N=72 (68 letters, 4 interviews) since those to whom letters were sent in the second group had not had time to reply at the time of preparation of this paper.

STATE	PRESIDENTS Letters sent or presidents interviewed (October 20, 1967)	REPLIES (By Nov. 21,1967)
Alabama	13	4
California[1]	4	4
Connecticut	7	3
Delaware	1	0
Georgia	3	2
Kansas	6	3
Kentucky	2	1
Massachusetts	1	1
Missouri	5	2
New Mexico	1	0
North Carolina	7	2
Oklahoma	6	4
Oregon	5	4
Rhode Island	1	0
Texas	2	2
Vermont	1	1
Virginia	2	1
Washington	5	2
	72	36[2]

[1] Four California interviews were personally conducted.
[2] Fifty per cent of the initial inquiries have been received.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

One-hundred and thirty community colleges were organized between 1963 and 1966. More than two-hundred will be established in the next three or four years.[1]

Using California as a statistical model we can view the growth in the junior college movement by observing the fact that there were 194,339 students enrolled in junior colleges in 1966. There are estimates that by 1980 there will be 300,450 students, and that number only represents California.[2]

For a national view, projections take the national student enrollment from 1,616,000 to over 2 million in 1970.[3]

The 1967 Junior College Directory also indicates 837 junior colleges in operation, 52 of which opened for the first time last fall. Of the 837 junior colleges listed, 272 are private and 565 public. In fact, all states except Nevada now have junior colleges.[4]

To capsulize some significant trends, we can look to the November, 1966 issue of the Junior College Journal.[5]

1. Last year there were 1.25 million students in junior colleges;
2. The annual increase in enrollments is 20 per cent and accelerating;
3. There are over 800 junior colleges now in the nation;
4. Last summer 190 junior colleges were in various stages of development;
5. Approximately fifty new junior colleges will open each year through 1970, and,
6. In the public sector alone, there will be more than 1,000 junior colleges within ten years.

The continued growth of the junior college movement seems immanent, and the quantitative nature of the problem--sheer numbers--must be squarely faced. In this decade alone (1960-1970) predicted growth in enrollment is 56.6 per cent as forecasted by the Bureau of the Census.[6]

In state after state, the realization is growing that a system of public junior colleges must assume a greatly enlarged role.

Impetus has been evidenced by one of the important objectives listed by the American Assembly, a group appointed by President Eisenhower, which indicated in its report "Goals for Americans" that:[7]

> "Two-year colleges should be roughly within commuting distance of every high school graduate, except in sparcely settled regions."

Who will plan these new campuses? Who will plan the new buildings and facilities? Are there a sufficient number of trained chief administrators available to meet this challenge?

Characteristics of Junior College Presidents

Early in 1965 the American Association of Junior Colleges published a monograph entitled, "Administrators for America's Junior Colleges: Predictions of Need 1965-1980," by Raymond E. Shultz.[8] Examining some of the findings of Shultz and others regarding presidents, will set the pattern for the problem with which this paper is concerned.

Dr. Shultz found that while the trend appears to be toward appointment from the ranks of the junior college, in 1963-64, 45.7 per cent of the presidential appointments that year were made from other

than junior college ranks, or to put it another way, 47 of 101 institutions studied will appoint a president from a cognate area. Dr. Shultz also identified a trend in the independent junior college toward recruitment from other than the junior college ranks.

The table below, developed from the findings of Dr. Shultz, clearly indicates a significant percentage of appointments from cognate fields.

AREAS OF APPOINTMENT OF JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
APPOINTED FROM COGNATE FIELDS

TABLE II

Area	Percentage
Senior Institutions	19.7 %
Public Secondary and Elementary Institutions	15.4
Graduate School, Governmental Service, Business and Industry	10.6
Total Appointments from Cognate Fields	45.7 %

There is a further trend toward junior college presidents coming directly from various educational administrative positions. In 1963-64, 83.5 per cent were appointed from educational administrative posts, the remaining 16.5 per cent being appointed directly from the classroom or from graduate school, governmental service or business and industry. Since only 68.3 per cent appointed before 1952 were in this category, a trend is indicated.

Also indicated was the fact that in recent years both public and private institutions have selected about as large a portion of their presidents from elementary and secondary administrative positions.[9]

A couple of additional factors seem worth mentioning. There seems to be a movement toward recruitment of older presidents. The implication to be drawn for the purpose of this study is that there will be a substantial number of vacancies created in the future due to retirement. This is underscored by the fact that one-fourth of the 114 presidents appointed in 1964 will reach retirement age within 15 years.[10]

Further, existing junior college presidents are being attracted to other positions with increasing frequency.

Also bearing directly on our problem is that partly due to attrition, partly due to growth, and probably numerous other factors, there seems to be an increasing percentage of presidents appointed each year who are new to that role. In 1963 the number was 59 compared to 104 in 1964, indicating an increase of 76 per cent in one year; and, to compound the problem, 40 per cent of the newly appointed presidents are appointed to new institutions.[11]

Here we see numbers of new appointments, appointments to new institutions, presidents being appointed from cognate areas, and additional vacancies being created by retirements. In fact, a recent article in College and University Business stated that a Board of Trustees may expect to seek a new president every eight years.[12]

It certainly seems reasonable in light of the above information that we consider an organized approach to the study of what has become a discipline in its own right: the junior college, and component to that, to the purpose of this study.

ORDER OF PRESENTATION OF DATA

Based on the 36 inquiries and interviews conducted, all presidents reacted positively to the possibility of a workshop in the summer of 1968.

Founded, then, on the one-hundred per cent support indicated, data applicable to the following questions are presented:

1. In your own situation, what problem or issue proved most difficult for you as a new president?

2. What topics or problems should be considered at such a workshop?

3. What suggestions do you have regarding methods and procedures?

4. Do you have in mind any types of materials which might to advantage be assembled---and in some instances perhaps specially prepared---prior to a workshop?

5. Ought wives be invited to such a workshop?

6. Would it be desirable to have combination, separate, or both types of sessions for wives?

7. What problem has been most difficult for the wife of a new president?

8. For what period of time should the workshop be held, i.e., duration and month?

WHAT PROBLEM PROVED MOST DIFFICULT FOR YOU AS A NEW PRESIDENT?

You can observe by looking at the inquiry that an attempt was made to allow free response within the guidelines of particular questions. All respondents did not reply specifically to each question; therefore, in presenting the data throughout this study only positive responses will be indicated.

Table I indicates a hierarchy of response. Twenty-five presidents responded to this particular item.

TABLE III

In your own situation, what problem or issue proved most difficult for you as a new president?

Area	Frequency	Per Cent
1. Human relationships, i.e., relations with faculty	15	57.9
2. Business operations and finance	3	11.5
3. Identifying administrative leadership and changing roles	2	7.7
4. Working with the Board of Trustees	2	7.7
5. Providing a comprehensive program when faced with a fixed income	1	3.8
6. Determination of curriculum of a new college	1	3.8
7. To gain the respect of the community, both parents and students, for a new community institution	1	3.8
8. Written policies and procedures	1	3.8
Total Responding	26	100.0 %

Three of the four presidents interviewed stressed human relations as an overriding problem and one which requires constant effort. The idea of administration seems to hinge on human relations. The translation of the financial aspects and philosophy into effective action, those interviewed seemed to feel, depends on human relations.

One president mentioned that he would like to have a full-time administrator whose responsibility it would be to hold meetings to keep everyone involved and informed. Sometimes, for example, decisions are misconstrued and faculty members feel disregarded, when in fact the lack of their involvement stemmed from the press for a decision or simply from the large numbers of individuals involved in the everyday activities of the college.

One comment was pointed:

> "In fact . . . have been asked to leave . . . positions (causes were). . .in two cases human relationships with faculty, and two over financial management."

Other characteristic comments such as these appeared in the responses:

> " . . . if I were to identify that which has been my sustaining 'confrontation,' it would be in the area of human relationships."

> "My greatest lack of knowledge was of the personnel with whom I would have to work."

> "The problems that I find most pressing in my own situation are those of human relationships, especially dealing with the new militant role of faculty association groups desiring to determine more and more policy for the institution, finance, plant and facilities, and administrative structure and relationships."

When one looks at Table IV, he can observe that the curricular areas most heavily indicated are implemented, in general, only through people

and one's relations with them.

Another impression I got from the responses was that there was a concern over the "nuts and bolts" of the financial management and operation of the junior college. Three of the respondents indicated by making comments such as:

"Business operations have become our most difficult area."

Comments such as those above had great effect on the respondents topical choices presented in Table IV.

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION AT A WORKSHOP FOR NEW JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: CONTENT

TABLE IV

Suggestion	Responses Frequency
From Inquiry:	
1. Human relationships	21
2. Administrative Structure and Relationship	16
a. Delegation and authority	
b. Line and staff functions	
c. Reporting structures	
d. Shifting structures as personnel increase	
3. Finance, budget, business management, college bookstore	15
4. Community service and relationship	12
5. Role and function of the junior college	11
6. Curriculum and instruction	10
7. Plant and facilities	10
8. Student services	6
Additional Topics Suggested:	
9. Working with the Board of Trustees	4
10. Use of data processing	3
11. Providing a comprehensive program on a fixed income	2
12. Long range planning	2
13. Organization of a junior college	1
14. Evaluation of instruction	1
15. Referendum procedures	1
16. Communications, both internal and external	1
17. Recruitment	1
18. Instructional media	1
19. Expansion of junior colleges to four-year institutions	1
20. Effective range for religious activities and chapel programs	1
21. Tuition	1
22. Accreditation	1
23. Quarter system	1
24. Use of advisory committees	1
25. Personnel negotiations	1

Since each president was given an unlimited number of topical choices, it would be of no evaluative merit to compute the percentage of each item to the total, but we can certainly see areas of interest by frequency.

Again we see the strong desire for work in the area of human relations, with twenty-one presidents indicating a desire for its inclusion, and making it the number one choice for content.

In the case of "Administrative Structure and Relationship," numerous comments were made in the responses which, while they were clearly identifiable with that topic, led me to list them with the item for reader distinction. And, one can also note the close conceptual relationship between the first two items. Items 9 and 16 also relate closely to the first two.

The comparison between the problems that individual presidents felt were their most difficult seem to relate very closely to the content areas in which all presidents are interested.

Again, we find "Finance" with 15 presidents indicating a desire for its inclusion, and interestingly, "Business Operations and Finance" on Table III show up as the most difficult problem indicated by three presidents.

Items 9-18 were suggestions of which no indication was given in the inquiry. It seems then that items indicated by more than one respondent as worthy may well be of interest to many.

One might categorize a couple of the additional items (9-18) with the responses from the inquiry, but in preparing this study, I felt

they were separate enough to mention.

The topical areas are certainly clear and distinct, and the frequency of responses on each speaks for itself.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR SUGGESTED WORKSHOP

TABLE V

From inquiry	Frequency	Specific Negative Reference
1. Visits to one or more junior college	15	1
2. Structure discussion	11	
3. Case method	10	
4. In-basket items	9	1
5. Social Occasions	8	
6. Lectures	6	3
Additional suggestions		
7. Consultants (brought in for specialized areas)	4	
8. Unstructured discussion	3	
9. "How do you do it" session	1	
10. "Before dinner happy hour each evening"	1	
11. Panel discussion followed by free discussion periods	1	
12. Small group sessions	1	

Fifteen of the respondents felt that visits to junior colleges would be an important part of such a workshop. Several indicated that such visits should be planned for junior colleges with different strengths and should be carefully scheduled for maximum benefit due to the limited time of the workshop. One president indicated that he felt that there was so much material to be covered that there would be no time to visit other campuses.

Some particular comments directed toward methods and procedures

were these:

> "I would suggest lecture by a recognized authority or practitioner of the trade, followed by group discussions."
>
> "Suggest obtaining viewpoints of business managers, governmental fiscal officers, experienced members of college boards of trustees, police chiefs, and suppliers of bookstore supplies (largely persons divorced from instruction)."
>
> "Formal dinners with speeches are, in my opinion, of limited value."
>
> "In my opinion, it (the in-basket) is too elementary and excludes the essential element of 'atmosphere' of the surrounding circumstances."
>
> "The use of 'in-basket' items and other such devices might be useful to stimulate discussion."

These comments are presented only as examples of the types that were made. One must analyze Table V to see the direction of the responses. However, enthusiastic statements were made regarding visits to junior colleges, especially due to the proximity of UCLA to such a diverse number.

Also, in general, strong comments were made regarding the value of the structured discussion, case, and in-basket method.

The general feeling also seemed to be that social occasions were useful for developing relationships with individuals who share common problems. One of the presidents interviewed suggested that a seminar of this type would probably develop relationships which would result in correspondence between the participants about problems after the workshop was over.

SUMMARY OF PRE-PREPARED MATERIALS PRESIDENTS FELT DESIRABLE TO BE ASSEMBLED FOR DISTRIBUTION

Twenty-one presidents indicated prepared materials of some type that they would like to have at such a workshop; five made no reference to prepared materials.

Table VI indicates the frequency with which materials were requested.

TABLE VI

Materials	Frequency
1. Booklets, brochures, catalogs	9
2. Administrative organization charts	7
3. Board rules and faculty manuals	6
4. Student handbooks	4
5. Case studies	2
6. Salary schedules	2
7. Fringe benefits	2
8. Accreditation requirements	2
9. Significant legislative acts	2
10. All policies and procedural documents	2
11. State and university requirements	2
12. Master campus plans from several colleges be made available for study	1
13. Staff letters	1
14. Outlines or summaries of in-service practice	1
15. Guidelines for effective public relations	1
16. Criteria for hiring teachers	1
17. Research studies	1
18. Tables and graphs showing trends	1

We see again a preponderance of interest in the structure of the administrative organization, an interesting phenomenon, the tenor of which was evidenced by all presidents interviewed and was particulary present for one reading the responses to the inquiry.

SHOULD WIVES BE INVITED AND IF SO WOULD IT BE DESIRABLE TO HAVE COMBINATION, SEPARATE OR BOTH TYPES OF SESSIONS FOR THE WIVES OF NEW PRESIDENTS?

Twenty-four presidents indicated that it would be desirable to invite their wives to such a workshop while four thought it would be of no value.

Of the twenty-four responding positively, twenty-three indicated that a combination of some separate sessions for wives and some joint sessions of presidents and wives would be desirable. Also, eight made particular reference to the value of separate sessions, and six made particular reference to the value of combination sessions.

Comments such as these were characteristic:

> "Since the wives of new college presidents have a tremendous adjustment to make, I also recommend an orientation session for wives."
>
> "A session for wives would be helpful. Perhaps suggestions from some experienced presidents' wives would be helpful here."
>
> "Personally, my own wife would like to attend but would prefer that activities requiring her participation be kept to a minimum."
>
> "We would, therefore, like to urge the invitation of wives and families. I believe the children of junior college administrators, if associated with children of other people in this field, would gain a good understanding of what their fathers are doing."

The comments above are indicative of the range of comments made regarding attendance of wives at such a workshop. In general, those

responding seemed to think the participation of wives a good idea.

An additional comment, while not directly related to this study since these presidents have already been appointed, was made by Holstrop in his article, "Interviewing Presidential Candidates."

> "Some boards insist that the wife accompany the presidential candidate to be formally or informally interviewed along with him. This practice is becoming increasingly common."

This comment does recognize that wives have a role to play, and that role is more and more becoming not only recognized by the community, but by boards of trustees.

WHAT PROBLEM OR ISSUE HAS PROVED MOST DIFFICULT FOR THE WIVES OF THE NEW PRESIDENTS?

Melvene Draheim Hardee, Professor of Higher kducation, at Florida State University at the Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute for Junior College Presidents and their wives held at Appalachian State Teachers College in 1961 made the following remark:[14]

> "Previously, when local Arabs traveled between their villages, their wives had walked twenty yards <u>behind</u> them as befitting their station in life. Now, wives (during the Second World War) walk twenty yards in <u>front</u> of their husbands. The shift, contrary to first guess, was occasioned NOT by any new ideas about the importance of women. . . . The advancing armies had placed a good many land mines in the area. It was the task of the Arabian women now to detonate them before their husbands came along."

A more serious comment was made at the same institute by Mrs. W. A. Hunt:[15]

> "I filled my days and nights too full. I would often feel pushed, exhausted and over concerned. I've learned to regulate, evaluate and use my time more advantageously."

Margaret I. Shultz, wife of Dr. Shultz noted earlier in this paper, posed some interesting questions at that institute:[16]

1. How much should a wife speak for her husband?
2. How controversial does she dare to be?
3. Should she even join local organizations?
4. If so, in what capacity?
5. Is she obligated to attend certain functions?

Many of the letters made no particular reference to the answer to this question since early in the inquiry we mentioned that the president

should not feel obligated to answer any one question.

However, it was mentioned by several that their wives had no problem making the transition. Two of the presidents interviewed felt that there was no overriding problem because they were members of the local unified before the college was formed, and the transition was one of the wife of a top administrator moving from one post to another, plus the fact that both had been members of their respective communities for a long time.

Several problems were pinpointed, however, and they are: (1) starting the faculty association; (2) understanding proper protocol; (3) human relations; (4) too little time left to properly support the wife of her responsibilities because of demands of the job; and (5) one comprehensive statement, which included problems surrounding social affairs of the college, the welcoming of new faculty wives, and responsibility for participation in campus events.

FOR WHAT PERIOD OF TIME SHOULD A WORKSHOP BE HELD, I.E., DURATION AND MONTH?

TABLE VII

Duration	Frequency
One week	22
Three days to one week	2
Maximum of two weeks	2
Two weeks (minimum)	1

All presidents responding indicated July as the most appropriate month.

SOME GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The growth of the junior college movement and the burgeoning population indicate establishment of large numbers of new junior colleges, which will in turn create a demand for increased numbers of chief administrators.

2. Large numbers of new appointments will also be made in the future due to attrition.

3. A trend is indicated toward appointment of junior college presidents from other types of administrative positions, and toward appointing older presidents.

4. While there is a trend toward appointment of new presidents from junior college ranks, a large percentage continue to be appointed from cognate areas.

Considering the background information, which among others led us to the above conclusions, the following, drawn from the data presented, seem evident:

1. A workshop for recently appointed junior college presidents with little background in the junior college would be desirable.

2. Human relations, working with personnel and faculty, is a problem many presidents felt most significant in their new positions.

3. Business operations are an area of concern to many presidents.

4. Human relations, administrative structure and relationships, finance, budget, and business operations rank high as areas new presidents would like to study.

5. If such a workshop is conducted, visits to junior colleges should be planned.

6. A combination of structured discussion, case and in-basket items should be planned.

7. A workshop should also provide for social occasions to allow participants to interact freely.

8. Various materials should be prepared for distribution. Booklets, brochures, catalogs, and administrative organization charts rank high on the list.

9. Wives should be invited to attend and several activities should be especially planned.

10. A workshop of one week during the month of July would be most appropriate when considering the presidents' heavy schedules.

FOOTNOTES

1. Edmond J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach," Junior College Journal, September, 1967, p. 5

2. Frank O. Hopkins, Information Kit for Speakers, Community Workers, Committee Members, November, 1966, p. 7

3. Jack C. Gernhard, "An Analysis," 1967 Directory of American Junior Colleges, p. 7

4. Ibid., p. 5

5. Edmond J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach," Junior College Journal, November, 1966, p. 7

6. Ray C. Maul, "The Biggest Problem, Finding Good Teachers," Junior College Journal, December, 1965, p. 5

7. B. Lamar Johnson, "A Look Backward Over the Week's Activities and a Look Forward," Exploring the Tasks of the Community Junior College Administrator, 1961, p. 47

8. Raymond E. Shultz, "Changing Profile of the Junior College President," Junior College Journal, October, 1965, p. 8

9. Ibid., p. 11

10. Ibid.,

11. Ibid., p. 13

12. Orley R. Herron, "Critical Test for Trustees: Selecting A College President," College and University Business, August, 1967, p. 10

13. Richard W. Holstrop, "Interviewing Presidential Candidates," Junior College Journal, October, 1967, p. 13

14. Margaret I. Shultz, "The Relationship of the President's Wife to the Women Faculty Members of the College," Proceedings of the Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute for Junior College Presidents and Their Wives, p. 83

15. Melvene Draheim Hardee, "The Relationship of the President's Wife to the Women Faculty Members of the College, Ibid., p. 89

16. Mrs. W. A. Hunt, "The Mistakes I've Made," Ibid., p. 87

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gleazer, Edmond J., Jr., "AAJC Approach," Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 38, No. 1, September, 1967.

2. Gleazer, Edmond J., Jr., "AAJC Approach," Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 37, No. 3, November, 1966.

3. Hardee, Melvene Draheim, "The Relationship of the President's Wife to the Women Faculty Members of the College," Leadership Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President, Proceedings of the Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute for Junior College Presidents and Their Wives, Appalachian State Teacher's College, Boone, North Carolina, August 7-12, 1961.

4. Harper, William A., (Editor), 1967 Junior College Directory, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

5. Hawk, Ray, "A Profile of Junior College Presidents," Junior College Journal, Vol. 30, February, 1960.

6. Herron, Orley R., "Critical Test for Trustees: Selecting A College President," College and University Business, Vol. 43, No. 2, August, 1967.

7. Holstrop, Richard W., "Interviewing Presidential Candidates," Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 38, No. 2, October, 1967.

8. Hunt, Mrs. W. A., "The Mistakes I've Made," Leadershop Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President, Proceedings of the Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute for Junior College Presidents and Their Wives, Appalachain State Teacher's College, Boone, North Carolina, August 7-12, 1961.

9. Johnson, B. Lamar, "A Look Backward Over the Week's Activities and a Look Forward," Exploring the Tasks of the Community Junior College Administrator, Proceedings of the First Junior College Teams Institute, University of Florida, Gainsville, 1961.

10. Maul, Ray C., "The Biggest Problem Finding Good Teachers," Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 36, No. 4, December, 1965.

11. Shultz, Margaret I., "The Relationship of the President's Wife to the Women Faculty Members of the College," Leadership Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President, Proceedings of the Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute for Junior College Presidents and Their Wives, Appalachian State Teacher's College, Boone, North Carolina, August 7-12, 1961.

12. Shultz, Raymond E., "The Changing Profile of the Junior College President," Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Vol. 36, No. 2, October, 1965.

13. Shultz, Raymond E., Administrators for America's Junior Colleges: Predictions of Need 1965-1980, American Association of Junior Colleges Monograph, 1965.